



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/775,184

02/11/2004

Felix Horber

UBS0005-US

1618

36183

7590

06/19/2009

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP  
875 15th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/19/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/775,184	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HORBER, FELIX	
	<b>Examiner</b> LE NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                        |                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/11/04</u> .                                                 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner made attempts and was unable to find a description and definition of the term "orphaned" and the phrase "determining whether links...are valid" in the body of the specification. Lacking a clear description/definition, the term and phrase render the claim indefinite given that it is unclear what is meant by "orphaned" in the context of determining/detecting *orphaned* content data and *orphaned* sites in lines 6-7 of claim 12 and lines 4-5 of claim 26 and how orphaned sites/content data and the links are related. Therefore, the claims will be interpreted as comprising: links and a step to determining whether user's attempt to access one of web pages and Web sites without proper authorization.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 6, 14, 16, 19, 22, 28-35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2).

As per claim 1, Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers each having one of a plurality of document formats (fig. 2; col. 5, lines 42-58; documents/files of a particular type may have one of a plurality of formats, e.g., MS Word with a file name such as story1.doc), wherein the electronic dossiers are accessible by a plurality of web site users via a computer network (col. 4, lines 5-9), the method comprising the steps of: selecting an electronic dossier for conversion (col. 4, lines 30-39; col. 5, lines 14-16 and 55-58; col. 7, lines 2-25; converting various file types to a standard format such as XML); obtaining one template associated with the format of the electronic dossier (col. 6, lines 30-34; col. 15, lines 15-18 and 21-22); obtaining, from a predetermined set of styles, at least a subset of style characteristics to be correlated to the format of the electronic dossier (col. 6, lines 49-54; e.g., all caps as well as font, font size, etc.); importing/converting the electronic dossier to a document platform having a unified format (col. 7, lines 2-25; XML); storing the converted

Art Unit: 2174

electronic dossier together with the obtained template and the obtained style subset in a unified database (col. 8, lines 41-43; col. 9, lines 42-46; col. 10, lines 54-56; wherein storing data in a common/unified database versus separate database is well known in the art, col. 1, lines 14-20); and providing access to the unified database to a plurality of users through a computer network browser interface in order to at least one of process, view, and store the converted electronic dossiers (col. 4, lines 5-9; viewable as a website following processing and storage). Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose that the template is obtained from a predetermined set of templates; however, obtaining a template from a predetermined set of templates is well known in the art as taught by Dang (col. 8, lines 6-8). In view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007), it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Dang with the method of Fitzsimons so that templates vary with organizations and the document types.

As per claim 3, the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein the computer network comprises a number of groups maintaining different sets of document platforms (Fitzsimons: col. 4, line 66 through col. 5, line 8; col. 12, lines 13-21; col. 13, lines 20-30).

As per claim 6, the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein each of the electronic dossiers in the unified database is organized as a part of a collection of hierarchically organized pages forming a site describing at least one of a product, a service, a process, and an organizational unit (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 4-17).

Claims 14, 29, 30, 32-34 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising at least one function chosen from the group consisting of: a platform manager function, the platform manager function including technical programming and development of the unified platform, a web manager function, the web manager function including publishing responsibilities for an entire business unit, including creation of web sites, definition of users, authorization of publishing functions, and providing information, data and support for publishing activities, a site manager function, the site manager function including allowing access to publishing functions of predefined sites, definition of local navigation, and ascertaining the compliance with the predetermined set of templates and the predetermined set of styles, a publisher function, the publisher function including the creation and formatting of pages of a web site, insertion of graphics on web pages, adding text on web pages, effecting changes and updates, and publishing and deactivating pages, a site owner function, the site owner function including responsibilities for the content of the web site, effecting administrative duties including the definition of guidelines for the provision of a web page in certain languages, the publication format, and an author function,

the author function including at least one of creation and provision of text and graphics, and provision of translations (), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose functions that include authorization of site managing functions, accessing web sites with predefined restrictions in their business area, creation and insertion of local navigation pointers into pages of a web site, defining and verifying links to pages, and the period of validity of certain pages of a web site; however, such functions are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include such well known functions with the method of the modified Fitzsimons to facilitate development and maintenance of a Web site, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale except for a browser interface feature, which the modified Fitzsimons also teaches (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 4-6).

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale except for a control element feature (for invoking commands), which the modified Fitzsimons also teaches (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 30-39; col. 5, lines 14-16 and 49-67; col. 7, lines 2-25; wherein style and content are inherently stored separately when using XML).

Claims 35 and 37 in combination are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale except for a browser interface feature, which the modified Fitzsimons also teaches (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 4-6).

As per claim 38, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein associating comprises storing, in a unified database, the electronic dossier along with a pointer to a storage location of the template and a storage location of the style characteristics (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 30-39; col. 5, lines 14-16 and 55-58; col. 7, lines 2-25; when using XML, style and content are inherently stored separately).

As per claim 39, the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising defining an XML Document Type Definition for the data (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 30-39; col. 5, lines 14-16 and 55-58; col. 7, lines 2-25; part of XML standard to define DTD for XML documents and is inherent to XML).

6. Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 15, 17, 20, 21 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Nies et al. ("Nies", US 7,418,431 B1).

As per claim 2, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein the electronic dossier format is chosen from the group consisting of: HTML pages, database content plus templates, static web pages, documents containing alphanumeric data, documents containing image data, and XML documents (Fitzsimons: col. 3, lines 25-34; col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 7, lines 26-29; col. 15, lines 15-18; Dang: col. 8, lines 6-8), Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose links to other Web sites; however, other formats such as links to other web sites is well known in the art as taught by Nies



(figs. 34-36). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Nies with the method of the modified Fitzsimons given such well known teachings, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

As per claim 4, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein each template of the predetermined set of templates is comprised of at least three distinct areas accessible through a graphical user interface, the distinct areas are chosen from the group consisting of a printing function and a top area having a space reserved for predetermined indicia of subject matter content such as a headline with a maximum hierarchical navigation depth and a content area having a predetermined layout according to the predetermined set of styles (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 24-26; col. 6, lines 49-54; col. 11, lines 26-34; col. 12, line 12 through col. 14, line 61), Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose a reference/pointer for a global navigation path, a pointer for a global topic, a pointer for a global function, a micro-identity area and a local navigation area having at least one pointer chosen from the group consisting of a pointer for a local navigation path, a pointer for a local page of the web site and a pointer for an page of an external web page. Nies teaches a pointer for a global navigation path, a pointer for a global topic, a pointer for a global function, a micro-identity area and a local navigation area having at least one pointer chosen from the group consisting of a pointer for a local navigation path, a pointer for a local page of the web site and a pointer for an page of an external web page (figs. 5 and 34-36; col. 8, lines 5-8; areas accessible through the GUI: an outer

Art Unit: 2174

area 510 comprising a recent history of user's path/global navigation path with global topics 512; and pointers for global functions 508 such as a messaging function for receiving and sending messages and global functions such as a printing function; a local navigation area provides a consistent display of tabs as user navigates from one page to another, the display comprise "Reports" and "Help" topics as well as an entry called "Home", which enable users to quickly return to the homepage and links that point to other pages or other sites so that users may select links to jump to another page or to jump to a link outside the site via 888). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Nies with the method of the modified Fitzsimons given such well known navigation tools, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

As per claim 7, the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein converting the electronic dossier includes the conversion of the electronic dossier to XML format and wherein content data within the electronic dossier is stored in the form of information blocks independent from one of the design and the layout of the content data (Fitzsimons: col. 4, lines 30-39; col. 5, lines 14-16 and 55-58; col. 7, lines 2-25; inherent feature of XML).

As per claim 8, the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising checking and verifying content data of the electronic dossier prior to its conversion for at least one of accuracy, timeliness,

Art Unit: 2174

and relevance to the site (col. 12, lines 17-19; the software checks for new material and whether it should be brought into the assembly line for publishing).

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20 and 36 individually are similar in scope to claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 8 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Bever et al ("Bever", US 7,069,508 B1).

As per claim 5, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein converting the electronic dossier to a unified format includes modifying at least one property of the electronic dossier chosen from the group consisting of: text font, font size (Fitzsimons: col. 6, lines 46-50), multimedia content (col. 4, lines 18-22; multimedia content include different medium, text and graphics (e.g., articles, photographs, etc.)) and titles (col. 4, line 26; e.g., headline), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose a font color, page color, background color, element spacing and subtitles. Bever teaches controlling a font color, page color, background color,

Art Unit: 2174

element spacing and subtitles (Abstract; col. 6, lines 23-36; col. 8, lines 49-51). ).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Bever with the method of the modified Fitzsimons in order to improve readability, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 9 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Rozenfeld et al ("Rozenfeld", US 7,191,239 B2).

As per claim 9, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising a web page in a certain requested language by an available language version of the web page (col. 4, lines 4-6; e.g., sport articles published on a website), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose substituting a web page not existing in a certain requested language by an available language version of the web page according to a predefined priority scheme. Rozenfeld teaches substituting a web page not existing in a certain requested language by an available language version according to a predefined priority scheme (col. 10, lines 5-13). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Rozenfeld with the method of the modified Fitzsimons in order to provide a

Art Unit: 2174

default language in cases where the requested language is currently unavailable, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

9. Claims 10 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Cochran et al. ("Cochran", US 2004/0030697 A1).

As per claim 10, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising receiving feedback information about content for a web page of a web site from a user (col. 9, lines 53-59), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose receiving feedback information about one of a web page and a web site from a user, routing the feedback information to a feedback database accessible by an administrator of the one of web page and a web site and entering the feedback information into the feedback database (par [0091]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Cochran with the method of the modified Fitzsimons in order to facilitate online submission and management of feedback, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 10 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

10. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Rhoads (US 2004/0022444 A1).

As per claim 11, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising providing web sites with access to images (col. 13, lines 19-30), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose access an integrated image library wherein the integrated image library has a hierarchical organization for distinguishing between images accessible by a plurality of websites and images accessible by a single website. Rhoads teaches an integrated image library wherein the integrated image library has a hierarchical organization for distinguishing between images accessible by a plurality of websites and images accessible by a single website (par [0353], [0610]-[0611], [0836], [0906]; images are distinguished as copyrighted or available in the public domain). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Rhoads with the method of the modified Fitzsimons in order to provide a level of access and security, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

11. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Miller et al. ("Miller", US 6,981,214 B1).

As per claim 12, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising determining whether users attempt to access the system without proper authorization, determining whether links within the converted electronic dossier are valid based on their type, determining whether the content data within the converted electronic dossier result in one of orphaned content data and orphaned sites, determining whether users attempt to access one of Web pages and Web sites without proper authorization and determining whether content data should be appended, replaced or amended (col. 9, lines 23-41; col. 11, lines 6-9; upon verification of user passwords, articles are mapped to a location of a Web page of corresponding Web sites), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose whether content data within a document has expired. Miller teaches determining whether content data within documents have expired (col. 8, lines 9-25). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Miller with the method of the modified Fitzsimons in order to automatically delete older content that is no longer relevant, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

12. Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Tan et al. ("Tan", US 2006/0026203 A1).

As per claim 13, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers comprising attaching extracted document related meta information to a document for search and retrieval by users of the unified database (col. 11, lines 5-21), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose scanning data to extract metadata. Tan teaches scanning data to extract metadata (par [0039], [0050]; meta-data extraction). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Tan with the method of the modified Fitzsimons in order to extract new or previously undiscovered information, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

13. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzsimons et al. ("Fitzsimons", US 6,708,189 B1) in view of Dang (US 7,007,231 B2), and further in view of Fordyce et al. ("Fordyce", US 2003/0149940 A1).

As per claim 40, although the modified Fitzsimons teaches a method for managing electronic dossiers wherein data of the electronic dossier comprises a paragraph and a web page (col. 4, lines 4-35), the modified Fitzsimons does not explicitly disclose a feature of storing each paragraph at a time as a basic unit. Fordyce teaches storing each paragraph at a time as a basic unit (par [0003]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Fordyce with the method of the modified Fitzsimons given that such a



Art Unit: 2174

feature is common, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

### ***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Arganbright et al. (US 6,980,962 B1) teach a contact us page for sending comments about the Web site.

### ***Inquires***

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow, can be reached at (571) 272-7767.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

Art Unit: 2174

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lvn  
Patent Examiner  
June 3, 2009

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174